

Enhanced effect of temporal variation of the fine structure constant and strong interaction in ^{229}Th

V.V. Flambaum

School of Physics, The University of New South Wales, Sydney NSW 2052, Australia

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

The relative effects of variation of the fine structure constant $\alpha = e^2/\hbar c$ and dimensionless strong interaction parameter m_q/Λ_{QCD} are enhanced 5-6 orders of magnitude in very narrow ultraviolet transition between the ground and first excited state in ^{229}Th nucleus (energy (3.5 ± 1) eV). Corresponding experiment has potential of improving sensitivity to the variation of the fundamental constants by 7-10 orders of magnitude (up to 10^{-23} per year).

PACS numbers: 06.20.Jr , 42.62.Fi , 23.20.-g

Unification theories applied to cosmology suggest a possibility of variation of the fundamental constants in the expanding Universe (see e.g. review [1]). There are hints of variation of α and $m_{q,e}/\Lambda_{QCD}$ in quasar absorption spectra, Big Bang nucleosynthesis and Oklo natural nuclear reactor data (see [2] and references therein). Here Λ_{QCD} is the quantum chromodynamics (QCD) scale, and m_q and m_e are the quark and electron masses. However, the majority of publications report only limits on possible variations (see e.g. reviews [1, 3]). A very sensitive method to study the variation in a laboratory consists of the comparison of different optical and microwave atomic clocks (see recent measurements in [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]). An enhancement of the relative effect of α variation can be obtained in a transition between almost degenerate levels in Dy atom [17]. These levels move in opposite directions if α varies. An experiment is currently underway to place limits on α variation using this transition [18], but unfortunately one of the levels has quite a large linewidth and this limits the accuracy. An enhancement of 1-3 orders exists in narrow microwave molecular transitions [19]. Some atomic transitions with enhanced sensitivity are listed in Ref. [20].

A very narrow level (3.5 ± 1) eV above the ground state exists in ^{229}Th nucleus [11] (in [12] the energy is (3.67 ± 0.03) eV, in [13] (5.5 ± 1) eV). The width of this level is estimated to be about 10^{-4} Hz [14] (the experimental limits on the width are given in [15]). This makes ^{229}Th a possible reference for an optical clock of very high accuracy, and opens a new possibility for a laboratory search for the variation of the fundamental constants [16]. Below I will show that there is an additional very important advantage. The relative effects of variation of α and m_q/Λ_{QCD} are enhanced by 5-6 orders of magnitude.

The ground state of ^{229}Th nucleus is $J^P[Nn_z\Lambda] = 5/2^+[633]$; i.e. the deformed oscillator quantum numbers are $N = 6$, $n_z = 3$, the projection of the valence neutron orbital angular momentum on the nuclear symmetry axis (internal z-axis) is $\Lambda = 3$, the spin projection $\Sigma = -1/2$, and the total angular momentum and the total angular momentum projection are $J = \Omega = \Lambda + \Sigma = 5/2$. The 3.5 eV excited state is $J^P[Nn_z\Lambda] = 3/2^+[631]$; i.e. it has the same $N = 6$ and $n_z = 3$. The values $\Lambda = 1$, $\Sigma = 1/2$ and

$J = \Omega = 3/2$ are different. The energy of both states may be described by an equation [21] $E = E_0 + C\Lambda\Sigma + D\Lambda^2$, i.e. the energy difference between the excited and ground state is $\omega = E_e - E_g = 2C - 8D$. The values of the constants C and D are presented, for example, in the book [21]. Note that ω is 5 orders of magnitude smaller than C and D . Therefore, for consistency of this simple valence model, we must take $2C \approx 8D$. Based on the data from [21] we will use the following numbers: $2C \approx 8D \approx -1.4$ MeV. The relative variation of the transition frequency may be presented as

$$\frac{\delta\omega}{\omega} = \frac{\delta(2C) - \delta(8D)}{\omega} \approx 0.4 \cdot 10^6 \left(\frac{\delta D}{D} - \frac{\delta C}{C} \right) \quad (1)$$

The large factor here appeared from the ratio $2C/\omega \approx 8D/\omega \approx -0.4 \cdot 10^6$ for $\omega = 3.5$ eV. The orbit-axis interaction constant D vanishes for zero deformation parameter β_2 . Therefore, we should assume that $D \approx \text{const} \cdot V_0\beta_2$ where V_0 is the depth of the strong potential. The nuclear deformation reduces the energy of the Coulomb repulsion between the protons. Without this repulsion the deformation parameter β_2 would probably be zero [22]. Therefore, it is natural to assume that $\beta_2 \approx \text{const} \cdot \alpha$. Thus we have $D \approx \text{const} \cdot V_0 \cdot \alpha$ and

$$\frac{\delta D}{D} \approx \frac{\delta V_0}{V_0} + \frac{\delta\alpha}{\alpha} \quad (2)$$

To estimate variation of V_0 we will use Walecka model [23] where the strong nuclear potential is produced by the sigma and the omega meson exchanges

$$V = -\frac{g_s^2}{4\pi} \frac{e^{-rm_\sigma}}{r} + \frac{g_v^2}{4\pi} \frac{e^{-rm_\omega}}{r} \quad (3)$$

Using eq. (3) we can find the depth of the potential well [24, 25]

$$V_0 = \frac{3}{4\pi r_0^3} \left(\frac{g_s^2}{m_\sigma^2} - \frac{g_v^2}{m_\omega^2} \right) \quad (4)$$

Here $r_0 = 1.2$ fm is an inter-nucleon distance. Note that the nuclear potential in this model is a highly tuned small difference of two large terms. Therefore, the contribution of the variation of r_0 is not as important as the contribution of the meson mass variation which is enhanced due

to the cancellation of two terms in V_0 . The result is [24]

$$\frac{\delta V_0}{V_0} \approx -8.6 \frac{\delta m_\sigma}{m_\sigma} + 6.6 \frac{\delta m_\omega}{m_\omega} \quad (5)$$

The final result will depend on the variation of the dimensionless parameter m_q/Λ_{QCD} . During the following calculations, we shall assume that Λ_{QCD} does not vary and so we shall speak about the variation of masses (this means that we measure masses in units of Λ_{QCD}). We shall restore the explicit appearance of Λ_{QCD} in the final answers. The dependence of the meson masses on the current light quark mass $m_q = (m_u + m_d)/2$ has been calculated in Ref. [26] $\frac{\delta m_\sigma}{m_\sigma} = 0.013 \frac{\delta m_q}{m_q}$, $\frac{\delta m_\omega}{m_\omega} = 0.034 \frac{\delta m_q}{m_q}$. This gives us

$$\frac{\delta V_0}{V_0} \approx 0.11 \frac{\delta m_q}{m_q} \quad (6)$$

The relatively small contribution of the light quark mass is explained by the fact that $m_q \approx 5$ MeV is very small. The contribution of the strange quark mass $m_s \approx 120$ MeV may be much larger. According to the calculation in Ref. [24] $\frac{\delta m_\sigma}{m_\sigma} \approx 0.54 \frac{\delta m_s}{m_s}$, $\frac{\delta m_\omega}{m_\omega} \approx 0.15 \frac{\delta m_s}{m_s}$, and $\frac{\delta V_0}{V_0} \approx -3.5 \frac{\delta m_s}{m_s}$. By adding all contributions we obtain

$$\frac{\delta D}{D} \approx \frac{\delta \alpha}{\alpha} + 0.11 \frac{\delta m_q}{m_q} - 3.5 \frac{\delta m_s}{m_s} \quad (7)$$

The reason for the enhancement here (~ 5 times) is the cancellation of the σ and ω meson contributions to V_0 (see eq. (4)) which appears in the denominator of the relative variation of D : $\frac{\delta D}{D} = \frac{\delta V_0}{V_0} + \dots$. However, the σ and ω mesons contribute with equal sign to the spin-orbit interaction constant C [27]. Therefore, there is no “cancellation” enhancement here. However, there is another efficient mechanism. The spin-orbit interaction is inversely proportional to the nucleon mass M_N squared,

$C \propto 1/M_N^2$, $\frac{\delta C}{C} = -2 \frac{\delta M_N}{M_N}$. The nucleon mass depends on the quark masses: $\frac{\delta M_N}{M_N} = K_q \frac{\delta m_q}{m_q} + K_s \frac{\delta m_s}{m_s}$ where $K_q=0.045$ and $K_s=0.19$ in Refs. [24, 28], $K_q=0.037$ and $K_s=0.011$ in Ref. [29], and $K_q=0.064$ in Ref. [26]. All three values of K_q are close to the average value $K_q=0.05$. However, different methods of calculations give very different values of K_s . Fortunately, this is not important since the strange mass dependence of σ -meson is much stronger than that of proton (due to the SU(3) symmetry σ contains valence $\bar{s}s$ pair, another factor is strong repulsion of σ from the close K^+K^- , $\bar{K}^0K^0$, $\eta\eta$ states [24]), also there is the “cancellation” enhancement of the σ contribution to D . As a result we have

$$\frac{\delta D}{D} - \frac{\delta C}{C} \approx \frac{\delta \alpha}{\alpha} + (0.11 + 0.10) \frac{\delta m_q}{m_q} - (3.5 - 0.2) \frac{\delta m_s}{m_s} \quad (8)$$

The final estimate for the relative variation of the ^{229}Th transition frequency in eq. (1) is

$$\frac{\delta \omega}{\omega} \approx 10^5 \left(4 \frac{\delta \alpha}{\alpha} + \frac{\delta X_q}{X_q} - 10 \frac{\delta X_s}{X_s} \right) \frac{3.5 \text{ eV}}{\omega} \quad (9)$$

where $X_q = m_q/\Lambda_{QCD}$ and $X_s = m_s/\Lambda_{QCD}$. Thus we have here five to six orders enhancement in the relative variation of the transition frequency. Another advantage is that the width of this nuclear transition is several orders of magnitude smaller than a typical atomic clock width ($\sim \text{Hz}$). Current atomic clocks limits on the variation of the fundamental constants are approaching 10^{-15} per year. With these two enhancement factors the result for ^{229}Th may be 7-10 orders of magnitude better. We conclude that this nuclear transition has an enormous potential for a laboratory search for the variation of the fundamental constants.

This work is supported by the Australian Research Council.

-
- [1] J-P. Uzan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 403 (2003);
 - [2] M.T.Murphy, J.K. Webb, V.V. Flambaum. Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **345**, 609-638 (2003). V.F. Dmitriev, V.V. Flambaum, J.K. Webb, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 063506 (2004). S. K. Lamoreaux and J. R. Torgerson Phys. Rev. D **69** 121701(R) (2004). E. Reinhold, R. Buning, U.Hollenstein, A. Ivanchik, P. Petitjean, W. Ubachs. Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 151101 (2006).
 - [3] S. G. Karshenboim, V. V. Flambaum, E. Peik. Atomic clocks and constraints on variations of fundamental constants. In “Handbook of atomic, molecular and optical physics” (Ed. G.W.F. Drake, Springer 2005), Chapter 30, pp.455-463; arXiv:physics/0410074.
 - [4] J.D. Prestage, R.L. Tjoelker, and L. Maleki. Phys. Rev. Lett **74**, 3511 (1995).
 - [5] H. Marion *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 150801 (2003).
 - [6] S. Bize *et al.*, arXiv:physics/0502117.
 - [7] E. Peik, B. Lipphardt, H. Schnatz, T. Schneider, Chr. Tamm, S.G. Karshenboim. Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** 170801 (2004); arXiv:physics/0402132 .
 - [8] S. Bize *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 150802 (2003).
 - [9] M. Fischer *et al.* arXiv:physics/0311128.
 - [10] E. Peik, B. Lipphardt, H. Schnatz, T. Schneider, Chr. Tamm, S. G. Karshenboim, arXiv:physics/0504101.
 - [11] R. G. Helmer and C. W. Reich. Phys. Rev. C **49**, 1845 (1994).
 - [12] G. M. Irwin, Ki-Hyon Kim, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. **42**, 1071 (1997).
 - [13] Z.O. Guimaraes-Filho, O. Helene . Phys. Rev. C **71**, 044303 (2005).
 - [14] E. V. Tkalya, A. N. Zherikhin, V. I. Zhudov, Phys. Rev. C **61**, 064308 (2000). A. M. Dykhne, E. V. Tkalya, Pis'ma Zh.Eks.Teor.Fiz. **67**, 233 (1998) [JETP Lett. **67**, 251 (1998)].
 - [15] I. D. Moore, I. Ahmad, K. Bailey, D. L. Bowers, Z.-T. Lu, T. P. O'Connor, Z. Yin. Argonne National Laboratory

report PHY-10990-ME-2004.

- [16] E. Peik, Chr. Tamm. *Europhys. Lett.* **61**, 181 (2003).
- [17] V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, J. K. Webb, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 230 (1999).
- [18] A. T. Nguyen, D. Budker, S. K. Lamoreaux and J. R. Torgerson *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 022105 (2004).
- [19] V. V. Flambaum, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 034101 (2006); physics/0601034.
- [20] E. J. Angstmann, V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, S. G. Karshenboim, A. Yu. Nevsky, *J. Phys. B* **39**, 1937 (2006), physics/0511180.
- [21] A. Bohr, B. R. Mottelson. *Nuclear structure*, V. 2. (Benjamin, New York, Amsterdam, 1974).
- [22] In principle, the shell effect may also produce some small non-zero deformation. Therefore, we should write $\beta_2 = c_0 + c_1 \cdot \alpha + c_2 \cdot \alpha^2 \dots$. However, ^{229}Th is not so far from the area of spherical nuclei and the linear term must be important. This justifies our estimate.
- [23] B. D. Serot and J. D. Walecka, *Adv. Nucl. Phys.* **16**, 1 (1986).
- [24] V. V. Flambaum, E. V. Shuryak. *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 083507 (2003).
- [25] Note that the suppression of the nucleon wave function at small separation due to the repulsive core reduces the depth of the effective potential V . However, this effect is not so important in the ratio $\frac{\delta V}{V}$.
- [26] V. V. Flambaum, A. Hoell, P. Jaikumar, C. D. Roberts and S. V. Wright nucl-th/0510075, *Few Body Systems* 38 (2006) pp. 31-51. A. Holl, P. Maris, C. D. Roberts and S. V. Wright, arXiv: nucl-th/0512048.
- [27] R. Brockmann, W. Weise. *Phys. Rev. C* **16**, 1282 (1977).
- [28] V. V. Flambaum, E. V. Shuryak. *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 103503 (2002).
- [29] V. V. Flambaum, D.B. Leinweber, A.W. Thomas, R.D. Young. *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 115006 (2004).